



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Treating cough due to non-CF and CF bronchiectasis with non-pharmacological airway clearance: CHEST Expert Panel Report.

Hill, A., Barker, A., Bolser, D. C., Davenport, P., Ireland, B., Chang, A. B., Mazzone, S. B., & McGarvey, L. (2018). Treating cough due to non-CF and CF bronchiectasis with non-pharmacological airway clearance: CHEST Expert Panel Report. *Chest*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2018.01.014>

Published in:
Chest

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

© 2017 The American College of Chest Physicians. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>, which permits distribution and reproduction for noncommercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Treating cough due to non-CF and CF bronchiectasis with non-pharmacological
airway clearance: CHEST Expert Panel Report

Hill AT, Barker A, Bolser DC, Davenport PW, Ireland B, Chang AB, Mazzone S,
McGarvey L

Affiliations

Adam T. Hill, MB ChB, MD (Royal Infirmary and University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland)
Alan F. Barker, MD (Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR)
Donald C. Bolser, PhD (College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL)
Paul Davenport, PhD (Department of Physiological Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL)
Belinda Ireland, MD, MS (TheEvidenceDoc) Pacific, MO
Anne B Chang, FRACP, PhD (Menzies School of Health Research; Respiratory and Sleep Dept, Lady Cilento Children's Hospital, Qld Uni of Technology Queensland, Australia)
Stuart B Mazzone, PhD, FCCP (University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia)
Lorcan Mc Garvey, MD (The Queens University Belfast, Belfast, United Kingdom)

Cough Due to Cystic Fibrosis (CF) Bronchiectasis and non-CF Bronchiectasis: CHEST
Expert Panel Report

Hill AT, Barker A, Bolser DC, Davenport PW, Ireland B, Chang A, Mazzone S,
McGarvey L

Affiliations: From the... TheEvidenceDoc (Dr. Ireland), Pacific, MO; ...

Corresponding Author: Prof. Adam T Hill
Department of Respiratory Medicine
Royal Infirmary and University of Edinburgh
51 Little France Crescent
Edinburgh,
Scotland,
UK
EH16 4SA

adam.hill318@nhs.net

+447974651333

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Treating cough due to non-CF and CF bronchiectasis with non-pharmacological airway clearance: CHEST Expert Panel Report

AUTHORS Hill AT, Barker A, Bolser DC, Davenport PW, Ireland B, Chang AB, Mazzone S, McGarvey L

Abstract

Background

In bronchiectasis, due to cystic fibrosis (CF) and other causes, airways clearance is one of the mainstays of management. We conducted a systematic review on airways clearance using non-pharmacological methods as recommended by international guidelines to develop recommendations or suggestions to update the 2006 CHEST guideline on cough.

Methods

The systematic search for evidence examined the question, “*Is there evidence of clinically important treatment effects for non-pharmacological therapies in cough treatment for patients with bronchiectasis?*”. Populations selected were all patients with bronchiectasis due to cystic fibrosis **or** non-CF bronchiectasis. The interventions explored were the non-pharmacological airway clearance therapies. The comparison populations included those on standard therapy or placebo. Clinically important outcomes that were explored were exacerbation rates, quality of life, hospitalizations and mortality.

Results

In both CF and non-CF bronchiectasis, there were systematic reviews and overviews of systematic reviews identified. Despite these, there were no large randomized controlled trials that explored the impact of airways clearance on exacerbation rates, quality of life, hospitalizations or mortality.

Conclusions

While the cough panel was not able to make recommendations, they have made consensus based suggestions and provided direction for future studies to fill the gaps in knowledge.

Abbreviations:

CF= cystic fibrosis

Summary of Suggestions

1. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that they be taught airway clearance techniques by professionals with advanced training in airways clearance techniques.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)
2. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that the frequency of airways clearance should be determined by disease severity and amount of secretions.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)
3. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that airway clearance techniques are individualized as there are many different techniques.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)

Remarks: These suggestions are based on clinicians' expertise in managing non-CF and CF bronchiectasis because there is a lack of large and/or high quality randomized controlled trials.

The costs can vary depending on the modality of airways clearance used. In European studies, the least expensive method, the active cycle breathing technique (ACBT) with or without postural drainage is used first line.¹ Other methods are considered if there is inability to carry out ACBT with or without postural drainage or there is a clinical deterioration necessitating alternative airways clearance techniques.

Background

In bronchiectasis due to cystic fibrosis (CF) and other causes, treatment of respiratory infections and airway clearance techniques are mainstays of management. The aims of airway clearance are to mobilize secretions from the airways and provide some control of cough. In clinical practice, there are a variety of techniques: active cycle breathing with or without the assistance of postural drainage; positive expiratory pressure; flutter-type devices; airway oscillation; respiratory muscle training; coached coughing; huffing; cough assist device (insufflation/exsufflation); assisted coughing (e.g., quad coughing); functional electrical stimulation; high frequency chest wall oscillators and general exercise. The aims of treatment are to clear the airways of tenacious secretions, reduce cough and sputum production, improve functional and health status, and **reduce the frequency and/or severity of** exacerbations. This expert panel report focuses on airway clearance as recommended by international guidelines.¹⁻⁵ We present evidence-based reviews for the key question developed on using non-pharmacological airway clearance techniques for the management of people with bronchiectasis, summary of the evidence and the formulated suggestions based upon these findings utilizing CHEST's cough guidelines methods and framework.⁶

Methods

The methodology of the CHEST Guideline Oversight Committee⁶ was used to select the Expert Cough Panel Chair and the international panel of pediatric and adult experts in non CF-bronchiectasis and cystic fibrosis to synthesize the evidence and

to develop the suggestions that are contained within this article. In addition to the quality of the evidence, the recommendation/suggestion grading also includes a strength of recommendation dimension, used for all CHEST Guidelines.⁶ The strength of recommendation here is based on consideration of three factors: balance of benefits to harms, patient values and preferences, and resource considerations. Harms incorporate risks and burdens to the patients that can include convenience or lack of convenience, difficulty of administration, and invasiveness. These, in turn, impact patient preferences. The resource considerations go beyond economics and should also factor in time and other indirect costs. The authors of these suggestions have considered these parameters in determining the strength of the suggestions.

The findings of a systematic search for and evaluation of evidence were used to support the evidence graded recommendations or suggestions. A highly-structured consensus-based Delphi approach was employed to provide expert advice on all guidance statements.⁶ The total number of eligible voters for each guidance statement did not vary because none were recused from voting on any statements because of their potential conflicts of interest. Transparency of process was documented. Further details of the methods related to conflicts of interests and transparency for all CHEST guidelines have been previously published.⁶

Based on the evidence review and the Delphi methodology described, the writing group developed guideline recommendations or suggestions. These then underwent review and voting by the full cough panel. For a recommendation or suggestion to be accepted, it had to be voted upon by 75% of the eligible Cough Panelists and achieve ratings of strongly agree or agree by 80% of the voting panelists. Agreement was achieved by 85-90% of those voting in the current recommendations. No panelist was excluded from voting.

Key Question Development

A key clinical question (KQ) was developed using the PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome) format. The following question was addressed:

“Is there evidence of clinically important treatment effects for non-pharmacological therapies in cough treatment for patients with bronchiectasis?”

Systematic Literature Search

A systematic literature search for individual studies was initially conducted using the following databases: MEDLINE via PubMed, EMBASE, and Scopus with date limitations from database inception through 05/09/13 for non-pharmacological therapies for airway clearance. Thirty systematic reviews were identified in the Cochrane Library and 83 in PubMed. Additional searches for trials were conducted in the 2 databases, with 229 identified in PubMed and 319 in the Cochrane Library. The search was updated in February of 2015 during which time separate searches were conducted for CF and for non-CF bronchiectasis in PubMed and the Cochrane Library. During this extended search, a total of 194 citations were retrieved for CF and 113 for non-CF bronchiectasis. To be certain that the most current versions of Cochrane reviews were used to inform the evidence, another search of the PubMed and Cochrane databases were performed on May 3, 2016. One update of an included Cochrane systematic review and five new systematic reviews were discovered while no newer primary studies were identified through this search. **(PRISMA flow chart- Figure 1).**

Using dual review, four panelists independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of the search results to identify potentially relevant articles based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion. Studies deemed eligible then underwent a second round of full-text screening for final inclusion. Important data from each included study were then extracted into structured evidence tables. (See Supplement) In each step, dual review and dual extraction were performed.

Quality assessment

The identified systematic reviews were assessed for quality and risk of bias using the Documentation and Appraisal Tool For Systematic Reviews (DART).⁷

Peer Review Process

The manuscript went through 2 rounds of review. During the first round, identified reviewers from the Guidelines Oversight Committee (GOC) of the CHEST Organization reviewed the content and methods of the manuscript for consistency, accuracy and completeness. The manuscript was revised after consideration by the panel of the feedback received from the GOC reviewers and then submitted to the *CHEST* journal for review by a representative from the CHEST Board of Regents, 1 of the 4 CHEST Presidents and journal-identified reviewers.

PICO Question Development

Initially, the key question was phrased as “*Is there evidence of clinically relevant treatment effects for non-pharmacological therapies in cough treatment for patients with diseases that affect airway clearance and ineffective cough?*” During the review process, the panel decided to substitute the word “important” for “relevant,” eliminate the phrase “ineffective cough” and to focus on bronchiectasis. The initial search included the term ineffective cough, however the subsequent searches did not.

The interventions included were the following non-pharmacological airway clearance therapies: positive expiratory pressure; vibrating vest; flutter-type devices; airway oscillation; conventional chest physiotherapy and postural drainage; respiratory muscle training; coached coughing (having patients start coughing at total lung capacity); huffing; cough assist device (insufflation/exsufflation); assisted coughing (quad coughing); functional electrical stimulation; and abdominal binders. The comparison

populations were on standard therapy and/or placebo. Clinically important outcomes that were assessed were exacerbation rates, quality of life, hospitalizations and mortality.

RESULTS:

Summary and Interpretation of the evidence for non-CF bronchiectasis.

After full text review by panelists and the methodologist, no primary studies met all criteria described under the section PICO question development. An updated search performed on 5/3/16 after full text review identified a good quality Cochrane overview of systematic reviews on the topic of pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions for bronchiectasis.⁸ Overviews of systematic reviews are a relatively new study design included in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.⁹ Overviews of Systematic Reviews compile evidence from multiple systematic reviews on an intervention into a single summary document. They are conducted following systematic and rigorous methods similar to systematic reviews, but include systematic reviews rather than primary studies.

The overview identified 9 eligible systematic reviews for the topic that included pharmacological therapies. Of these 9, only 4 examined non-pharmacological methods. One of the 4 was on singing and another compared nurse to doctor led care. Two good quality systematic reviews examining the effectiveness of non-pharmacological airway clearance therapies remained. One of these reviews¹⁰ evaluated an airway clearance technique that used a twice-daily oscillatory Positive Expiratory Pressure (PEP) device in one very small study of 20 adult subjects. This was a cross over study that compared 3 months of treatment using an Acapella PEP device versus no chest physiotherapy in patients that admitted not practicing regular airway clearance.¹¹ In addition to being very small, the single study was assessed by the systematic review authors as having a high risk of bias. This leads to an overall assessment of very low quality for the finding of non-significant reduction in exacerbations. The review also evaluated quality of life but

241 did not report confidence intervals around the mean difference so that significance could
242 not be assessed. Hospitalization and mortality were not assessed in this study. The
243 updated search for Cochrane systematic reviews did discover an update of this systematic
244 review in 2015. However, the updated systematic review did not identify any new
245 primary studies that evaluated the clinically important outcomes we specified.

246
247 The second systematic review evaluated physical training using Inspiratory Muscle
248 Training compared to no or sham therapy. This review identified 2 eligible trials with a
249 combined total of only 43 subjects.¹² The authors of the overview also described
250 additional small studies not included in the Bradley systematic review in their evidence
251 map. One, a small study in 32 patients showed that the positive training benefits with
252 pulmonary rehabilitation are maintained with adjunct of inspiratory muscle training.¹³ A
253 further study in 26 patients showed no quality of life improvement despite improved
254 respiratory muscle strength.¹⁴ The systematic review measured quality of life using the
255 Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire.¹⁵ The authors reported major deficiencies in
256 the primary studies including no description of randomization, no summary of findings,
257 blinding was not possible, the subject groups differed at study start, and the total Jadad
258 quality score was only 1/5. In summary, the 2 very small trials included in the second
259 systematic review had high risk of bias. This leads to an overall assessment of very low
260 quality and very low confidence in any findings. Therefore, no reliable evidence for non-
261 pharmacological techniques to improve clinically important outcomes in non-CF
262 bronchiectasis was identified.

263
264 Our findings are dissimilar to the most recent Cochrane review¹⁰ on this subject since
265 only one of the seven studies in the Cochrane review met all our inclusion criteria.

267 **Discussion**

268
269 There is a lack of large and/or high quality trials that address the clinically important
270 outcomes of exacerbation rates, quality of life, hospitalizations or mortality. The absence

of high quality evidence does not imply that efforts to assist airways clearance be abandoned since it is a standard component of the management of bronchiectasis.

Summary and Interpretation of the evidence for CF bronchiectasis.

After full text review by panelists and the methodologist, no primary studies met all criteria described under the section PICO question development. Four Cochrane systematic reviews were identified. An updated search performed on 5/3/16 after full text review of the primary studies and specifically focusing on systematic reviews identified two updates of the Cochrane systematic reviews and three additional Cochrane systematic reviews on various non-pharmacological interventions for cystic fibrosis. Of those 7 total systematic reviews identified, only 5 reported on the clinically important outcomes of mortality, hospitalizations, exacerbations and quality of life and these were of good quality.

The 5 systematic reviews examined the following interventions:

- Positive Expiratory Pressure (PEP) compared to Conventional Chest Physiotherapy Techniques (CCPT).
- Positive Expiratory Pressure (PEP) compared to oscillating devices.
- Various Forced Expiration Techniques (FET) and Conventional Chest Physiotherapy Techniques (CCPT) comparisons.
- Inspiratory muscle training methods (IMT) compared to each other, to no or sham methods.

A Cochrane review by Main et al¹⁶ compared Conventional Chest Physiotherapy Techniques (CCPT) with other airway clearance techniques and examined some clinically important outcomes. One study of 61 subjects examined quality of life, 2 studies of 79 subjects examined number of hospital days and 2 studies of 99 subjects examined number of admissions per year. For quality of life, 1 study was available as an abstract only so the authors report unclear risk of bias and a low-quality score (2/5 Jadad). Data were not reported, only the overall finding of no difference between CCPT and PEP. For number of hospital days, 1 small study of 16 subjects comparing CCPT to Airway

Oscillating Devices (AOD) was available as abstract only so no quality assessment was performed. The range of values for the mean difference was broad, finding no significant difference. The study of 63 subjects comparing CCPT to Active Cycle of Breathing Techniques (ACBT)/Forced Expiration Technique (FET) did not report data. For number of admissions per year, one study of 36 subjects compared CCPT to Positive Expiratory Pressure (PEP) and the other study of 63 subjects compared CCPT to ACBT/FET. Neither study found a significant difference between methods. The inability to evaluate whether any newer techniques are better than CCPT in cystic fibrosis is due to insufficient data.

A Cochrane review by McIlwaine et al¹⁷ compared PEP to oscillating devices and evaluated the outcome of exacerbations. Four studies were examined and data were analyzed for 2 studies that were both rated as having low risk of bias by the reviewing authors. One study of 88 subjects over 1 year found a significant reduction in exacerbations for PEP compared to high frequency chest wall oscillation (HFCWO) RR= 0.73 (95% CI 0.55-0.95). The mean number of pulmonary exacerbations were 1.14 for PEP vs. 2.0 for HFCWO and time to first pulmonary exacerbation was 220 days for PEP vs. 115 days for HFCWO, $p=0.02$.¹⁸ The study of PEP vs. oscillating PEP included 41 subjects and found no significant difference.

A Cochrane review by McKoy¹⁹ compared FET (active cycle breathing technique) to CCPT + FET for the outcome of exacerbations. One prospective study of 63 subjects over 3 years was included that suffered from unclear allocation concealment and blinding was not possible. There was 6% loss to follow-up and no intention to treat analysis. There was no significant difference between treatments, with 9 out of 31 patients receiving FET and 5 of 30 receiving CCPT + FET experiencing exacerbations RR = 1.64 (95% CI 0.62-4.34).

A Cochrane review by Morrison²⁰ compared oscillatory devices to PEP for the outcomes of quality of life, exacerbations and number and days of hospitalizations. For quality of life that was assessed using Quality of Well-being Scale (QWBS) or Chronic Respiratory

Disease Questionnaire (CRDQ), there were 2 studies of 88 and 43 subjects that reported data. One study had an early dropout rate of nearly 20% and in the other the groups differed at study start. There was no significant difference in quality of life between the groups. For exacerbations, one study of 88 subjects reported data. This study had an early dropout rate of nearly 20%. The study reported an increase in the requirement of antibiotics for exacerbations OR = 4.10 (1.42 - 11.84) for oscillation devices compared to PEP. This is the same study reported in the review by McIlwaine (see above). For number of hospitalizations, 1 study of 42 subjects found no significant difference between groups. For days of hospitalization, 3 studies of 86 total subjects comparing oscillation devices to CCPT were all reported to suffer from high risk of bias. There were no significant differences between groups.

A Cochrane review by Houston et al²¹ examined inspiratory muscle training (IMT) as achieved by voluntary isocapnic hyperpnea, resistive loading or threshold loading compared with each other or with none or sham. Only 2 studies with a total of 180 adult subjects with CF were included. Both studies were poorly reported (1 was only available as an abstract) and the authors rated the studies at high risk of bias. Quality of life was assessed but no outcome data reported. The authors concluded that they didn't find any evidence to suggest that the treatment was either beneficial or not and they advised that practitioners evaluate on a case-by-case basis whether or not to employ this therapy.

While the systematic reviews were of good quality, most of the individual studies were not. All studies were small and were likely underpowered and provided insufficient data to identify differences between groups.

Only one primary study included in the 5 systematic reviews reported any significant differences between groups. That study, McIlwaine and colleagues, compared high frequency chest wall oscillation (HFCWO) to PEP in 88 analyzed subjects.¹⁸ It was reported as being at low risk of bias and found an increase in exacerbations in subjects using HFCWO compared to those using PEP.

In summary, there is insufficient evidence that any airway clearance technique is consistently more effective than any other for clinically important outcomes in CF bronchiectasis. The absence of high quality evidence does not imply that efforts to assist airways clearance be abandoned since it is a standard component of the management of CF.

Summary of Suggestions

1. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that they be taught airway clearance techniques by professionals with advanced training in airways clearance techniques.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)
2. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that the frequency of airways clearance should be determined by disease severity and amount of secretions.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)
3. **For children and adults with productive cough due to bronchiectasis related to any cause, we suggest that airway clearance techniques are individualized as there are many different techniques.** (Ungraded Consensus-Based Statement)

Remarks: These suggestions are based on clinicians' expertise in managing non-CF and CF bronchiectasis because there is a lack of large and/or high quality randomized controlled trials.

The costs can vary depending on the modality of airways clearance used. In European studies, the least expensive method, the active cycle breathing technique (ACBT) with or without postural drainage is used first line.¹ Other methods are considered if there is inability to carry out ACBT with or without postural drainage or there is a clinical deterioration necessitating alternative airways clearance techniques.

Areas of Future Research:

Airways clearance research in bronchiectasis due to CF or non-CF bronchiectasis has been underwhelming due to the lack of adequately powered randomized controlled trials. These trials are challenging as ideally the comparator arm would be no physiotherapy, making the studies challenging to blind and leading to ethical challenges, due to airway clearance being regarded as standard care. This has led to under-powered comparator studies of one technique versus another technique. Future studies assessing the optimum method, duration and frequency for long term (more than 28 days) airways clearance with clinical important outcomes are needed as well as the optimum target group.

To advance the field, there are several potential research endeavors that should be undertaken. They are enumerated here:

- 1] To determine the clinically meaningful role of any non-pharmacological airway clearance modality, clinically important outcomes such as exacerbation rate, hospitalization rate, quality of life using an instrument validated in CF and/or bronchiectasis, or mortality should be targeted as primary outcomes in future studies.
- 2] Does regular daily airway clearance improve outcomes (e.g. reduce the duration and frequency of exacerbations, improve QoL) in children and adults with non-CF and CF bronchiectasis?
- 3] What is the optimum method for long term (more than 28 days) airways clearance in children and adults with non-CF and CF bronchiectasis that will lead to meaningful clinical outcomes?
- 4] What is the optimum duration and frequency for daily long term (more than 28 days) airways clearance in children and adults with non-CF and CF bronchiectasis that will lead to meaningful clinical outcomes?

5] What target group(s) among children and adults with CF and non-CF bronchiectasis will benefit in meaningful clinical outcomes from airway clearance considering severity of bronchiectasis, frequency of exacerbations and comorbidities?

Conclusion:

Since publication of the 2006 CHEST Cough Guidelines,⁴ the effect of non-pharmacological airway clearance techniques on meaningful clinical outcomes in non-CF and CF bronchiectasis such as rates of exacerbations, hospitalizations, quality of life and mortality is still not known. The systematic review portion of this article has identified gaps in our knowledge and areas for future research. Just as stated in the 2006 guidelines, a plea is again made that clinically important outcomes should be targeted as primary outcomes in future studies to determine the meaningful role of non-pharmacological airway clearance modalities.

Acknowledgments: Author Contributions. This needs to be done

Conflicts of interest: The authors, AH, DB, PD, BI, AC, and SM have no financial or conflicts of interest regarding the content of this manuscript. AB is an educational consultant to International Biophysics.

Endorsements: To be added at the end of process

Collaborators: Todd M. Adams, MD (Webhannet Internal Medicine Associates of York Hospital), Kenneth W. Altman, MD, PhD (Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX), Elie Azoulay, MD, PhD (University of Paris, Paris, France), Alan F. Barker, MD (Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR), Surinder S. Birring, MBChB, MD (Division of Asthma, Allergy and Lung Biology, King's College London, Denmark Hill, London,

452 United Kingdom), Fiona Blackhall, MD, PhD (University of Manchester, Department
 453 of Medical Oncology, Manchester, England), Donald C. Bolser, PhD (College of
 454 Veterinary Medicine, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL), Louis-Philippe Boulet, MD,
 455 FCCP (Institut universitaire de cardiologie et de pneumonologie de Québec, Quebec,
 456 [IUCPQ], QC, Canada), Christopher Brightling, MBBS, PhD, FCCP (University of
 457 Leicester, Glenfield Hospital, Leicester, United Kingdom), Priscilla Callahan-Lyon, MD
 458 (Adamstown, MD), Anne B. Chang, MBBS, PhD, MPH (Royal Children's Hospital,
 459 Queensland, Australia), Quebec, QC, Terrie Cowley (The TMJ Association, Milwaukee,
 460 WI), Ali A. El Solh, MD, MPH (University at Buffalo, State University of New York,
 461 Buffalo, NY), Patricio Escalante, MD, MSc, FCCP (Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN),
 462 Stephen K. Field, MD (University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada), Dina Fisher, MD,
 463 MSc (University of Calgary, Respiratory Medicine, Calgary, AB, Canada), Cynthia T.
 464 French, PhD, FCCP (UMass Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA), Peter Gibson,
 465 MBBS (Hunter Medical Research Institute, New South Wales, Australia), Susan M.
 466 Harding, MD, FCCP (Division of Pulmonary, Allergy and Critical Care Medicine,
 467 University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL), Anthony Harnden, MB ChB,
 468 MSc (University of Oxford, Oxford, England), Adam T. Hill, MB ChB, MD (Royal
 469 Infirmary and University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland), Richard S. Irwin, MD,
 470 Master FCCP (UMass Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA), Peter J. Kahrilas, MD
 471 (Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL), Joanne Kavanagh,
 472 MBChB, (Division of Asthma, Allergy and Lung Biology, King's College London,
 473 Denmark Hill, London, United Kingdom), Karina A. Keogh, MD (Mayo Clinic,
 474 Rochester, MN), Kefang Lai, MD, PhD (First Affiliated Hospital of Guangzhou Medical

475 College, Guangzhou, China), Andrew P. Lane, MD (Johns Hopkins University School of
 476 Medicine, Baltimore, MD), Kaiser Lim, MD, J. Mark Madison, MD, FCCP, (UMass
 477 Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA), Mark A. Malesker, PharmD, FCCP
 478 (Creighton University School of Pharmacy and Health Professions, Omaha, NE), Stuart
 479 Mazzone, PhD, FCCP (University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia), Lorcan McGarvey,
 480 MD (The Queens University Belfast, Belfast, United Kingdom), Joshua P. Metlay, MD,
 481 PhD (Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts
 482 General Hospital, Boston, MA), Alex Molasaitis, PhD, MSc, RN (Hong Kong
 483 Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China), Abigail Moore, BM BCh, (University of
 484 Oxford, Oxford, England), M. Hassan Murad, MD, MPH (Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN),
 485 Mangala Narasimhan, DO, FCCP (Hofstra-Northwell Health, Manhasset, NY), Huong Q.
 486 Nguyen, PhD, RN (Kaiser Permanente, Pasadena, CA), Peter Newcombe, PhD (School
 487 of Psychology University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia), John Oppenheimer,
 488 MD (UMDNJ-Rutgers University), Marcos I. Restrepo, MD, MSc, FCCP (South Texas
 489 Veterans Health Care System, San Antonio), Mark Rosen, MD, Master FCCP (Icahn
 490 School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY), Bruce Rubin, MEng, MD, MBA
 491 (Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA), Jay H. Ryu, MD, FCCP (Mayo
 492 Clinic, Rochester, MN), Sonal Singh, MD, MPH (UMass Memorial Medical Center,
 493 Worcester, MA), Maeve P. Smith, MB ChB, MD (University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB,
 494 Canada), Susan M. Tarlo, MBBS, FCCP (Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, ON,
 495 Canada), Julie Turmel, PhD (Quebec Heart and Lung Institute, Laval University,
 496 Quebec), Anne E. Vertigan, PhD, MBA, BAppSc (SpPath) (John Hunter Hospital, New
 497 South Wales, Australia), Gang Wang, MD, PhD (Sichuan University, West China

Hospital, Chengdu, China), Miles Weinberger, MD, FCCP (University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA).

References

- 1 Pasteur MC, Bilton D, Hill AT, et al. British Thoracic Society guideline for non-CF bronchiectasis. *Thorax* 2010; 65 Suppl 1:i1-58
- 2 Hill AT on behalf of the British Thoracic Society. British Thoracic Society Quality Standards for clinically significant bronchiectasis in adults. [http://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/Portals/0/Guidelines/Bronchiectasis/244457 BTS Quality Standards Bronchiectasis.pdf](http://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/Portals/0/Guidelines/Bronchiectasis/244457_BTS_Quality_Standards_Bronchiectasis.pdf). 2012; 4
- 3 Chang AB, Bell SC, Torzillo PJ, et al. Chronic suppurative lung disease and bronchiectasis in children and adults in Australia and New Zealand Thoracic Society of Australia and New Zealand guidelines. *Med J Aust* 2015; 202:21-23
- 4 Rosen MJ. Chronic cough due to bronchiectasis: ACCP evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. *Chest* 2006; 129:122S-131S
- 5 Smyth AR, Bell SC, Bojcin S, et al. European Cystic Fibrosis Society Standards of Care: Best Practice guidelines. *J Cyst Fibros* 2014; 13 Suppl 1:S23-42
- 6 Lewis SZ, Diekemper RL, French CT, et al. Methodologies for the development of the management of cough: CHEST guideline and expert panel report. *Chest* 2014; 146:1395-1402
- 7 Diekemper RL, Ireland BK, Merz LR. Development of the Documentation and Appraisal Review Tool for Systematic Reviews. *World J Meta-Anal* 2015; 3(3):142-150
- 8 Welsh EJ, Evans DJ, Fowler SJ, et al. Interventions for bronchiectasis: an overview of Cochrane systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015:CD010337
- 9 Higgins J.P.T G, S. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 2011; Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]
- 10 Lee AL, Burge AT, Holland AE. Airway clearance techniques for bronchiectasis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015:CD008351
- 11 Murray MP, Pentland JL, Hill AT. A randomised crossover trial of chest physiotherapy in non-cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis. *Eur Respir J* 2009; 34:1086-1092
- 12 Bradley J, Moran F, Greenstone M. Physical training for bronchiectasis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2002:CD002166

- 13 Newall C, Stockley RA, Hill SL. Exercise training and inspiratory muscle training in patients with bronchiectasis. *Thorax* 2005; 60:943-948
- 14 Liaw MY, Wang YH, Tsai YC, et al. Inspiratory muscle training in bronchiectasis patients: a prospective randomized controlled study. *Clin Rehabil* 2011; 25:524-536
- 15 Regueiro EM, Burtin C, Baten P, et al. The minimal important difference of the pulmonary functional status and dyspnea questionnaire in patients with severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Respir Res* 2013; 14:58
- 16 Main E, Prasad A, Schans C. Conventional chest physiotherapy compared to other airway clearance techniques for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005:CD002011
- 17 McIlwaine M, Button B, Dwan K. Positive expiratory pressure physiotherapy for airway clearance in people with cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015:CD003147
- 18 McIlwaine MP, Alarie N, Davidson GF, et al. Long-term multicentre randomised controlled study of high frequency chest wall oscillation versus positive expiratory pressure mask in cystic fibrosis. *Thorax* 2013; 68:746-751
- 19 McKoy NA, Saldanha IJ, Odelola OA, et al. Active cycle of breathing technique for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; 12:CD007862
- 20 Morrison L, Agnew J. Oscillating devices for airway clearance in people with cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014:CD006842
- 21 Houston BW, Mills N, Solis-Moya A. Inspiratory muscle training for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013:CD006112

Legend:

Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart PRISMA Flow Chart for Non-Pharmacological airway clearance treatment for children and adults with CF and non-CF Bronchiectasis.

